arXiv:1409.8334v1 [math.OA] 29 Sep 2014

A REMARK ON CONTRACTING INVERSE SEMIGROUPS

Giuliano Boava and Ruy Exel

A semi-lattice is said to be tree-like when any two of its elements are either orthogonal or comparable. Given an inverse semigroup $\mathcal{S}$ whose idempotent semi-lattice is tree-like, and such that all tight filters are ultra-filters, we present a necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{S}$ to be contracting which looks closer in spirit to the notion of contracting actions than a recent condition found by the second named author and E. Pardo.

1. Introduction.

In a recent paper by the second named author and E. Pardo [**4**], the notion of locally contracting groupoids introduced by Anantharaman-Delaroche in [**1**] was extended to inverse semigroups [**4**: Definition 6.4], as well as to actions of inverse semigroups on topological spaces [**4**: Definition 6.2]. Given an inverse semigroup $\mathcal{S}$, these concepts were shown to relate to each other via the standard action of $\mathcal{S}$ on $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\rm tight}$, the tight spectrum of its idempotent semi-lattice. To be precise it was shown in [**4**: Theorem 6.5] that $\mathcal{S}$ is locally contracting iff[1] the standard action of $\mathcal{S}$ on $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\rm tight}$ is locally contracting.

In [**4**: Proposition 6.7], another condition (rephrased here as (4.1.iii)), which is a lot nicer to state, and which follows the general paradigm of local contractiveness more closely, was shown to be *sufficient* for the local contractiveness of $\mathcal{S}$. In our main result, Theorem (4.1) below, we take a closer look at this condition and show it to be also *necessary*, provided the inverse semigroup is *tree-like*.

One of the key tools to prove our main result is Theorem (2.1), a curious combinatorial fact which we suspect may be known to specialist in Combinatorial Analysis, but which we have not found anywhere in the literature.

Tree-like inverse semigroups are quite common, especially in the theory of graph C*-algebras (see e.g. [**3**: Lemma 35.8]), so we feel that this class of inverse semigroups deserves further study.

This paper is written under the assumption that the reader is acquainted with [**4**], and to a certain extent also with [**2**], from where the basic theory of tight representations of inverse semigroups is drawn.

2. A Combinatorial Lemma.

In this short section we will prove a crucial combinatorial result to be used in our main result below.

Date: 30 August 2014.

Key words and phrases: Inverse semigroup, semi-lattices, tight spectrum, tight filter, ultra-filter, contracting actions.

The first-named author was partially supported by CNPq.

[1] The "if" part in fact requires that all tight filters be ultra-filters, a condition that has been referred to by the name of *compactable* in [**5**].

2.1. Theorem. *Let X be a set which is decomposed as a finite disjoint union*

$$X = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{n} X_i,$$

where each X_i is a nonempty subset, and let $f : X \to X$ be a one-to-one map such that for every integer $m \geq 0$, and every $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$, one has that either

$$\begin{cases} f^m(X_i) \cap X_j = \emptyset, & \text{or} \\ f^m(X_i) \subseteq X_j, & \text{or} \\ f^m(X_i) \supseteq X_j. \end{cases} \tag{2.1.1}$$

Then:

(i) *there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $m > 0$, such that $f^m(X_i) \subseteq X_i$,*

(ii) *if f is not surjective, there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $m > 0$, such that $f^m(X_i) \subsetneq X_i$.*

Proof. Let us begin by proving (i). For each $m > 0$, let $A^m = \{A^m_{i,j}\}_{i,j}$ be the $n \times n$ matrix defined by

$$A^m_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } f^m(X_i) \cap X_j \neq \emptyset, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Case 1: Suppose that there exists some $m > 0$, such that every row of A^m has at most one (hence exactly one) nonzero entry. In this case, for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have that $f^m(X_i)$ intersects a single X_j, so it must be contained in that X_j. We may therefore define a function

$$k : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\},$$

such that

$$f^m(X_i) \subseteq X_{k(i)}, \quad \forall\, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

From this it easily follows that

$$f^{pm}(X_i) \subseteq X_{k^p(i)}, \quad \forall\, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, \quad \forall\, p > 0. \tag{2.1.2}$$

Given that the set $\{k^p(1) : p > 0\}$ is finite, we may choose integers p and q, with $0 < p < q$, and $k^p(1) = k^q(1)$. Defining

$$i := k^p(1) = k^q(1),$$

we then have that both $f^{pm}(X_1)$ and $f^{qm}(X_1)$ are contained in X_i. Setting $r = q - p$, observe that

$$X_i \supseteq f^{qm}(X_1) = f^{(r+p)m}(X_1) = f^{rm}\big(f^{pm}(X_1)\big) \subseteq f^{rm}(X_i).$$

The nonempty set $f^{qm}(X_1)$ is therefore contained in both X_i and $f^{rm}(X_i)$, whence

$$\emptyset \neq X_i \cap f^{rm}(X_i) \overset{(2.1.2)}{\subseteq} X_i \cap X_{k^r(i)}.$$

As the X_j are pairwise disjoint, we deduce that $k^r(i) = i$, which is to say that

$$f^{rm}(X_i) \subseteq X_i,$$

concluding the proof of (i) in the present case.

Case 2: Failing the condition characterizing case (1) above, we are left with the assumption that, for every $m > 0$, at least one row of A^m has two or more nonzero entries.

Since A^m is a 0-1 matrix, of which there are only finitely many (there are exactly 2^{n^2} such matrices), there must be repetitions among the A^m, meaning that there are integers m_1 and m_2, with $0 < m_1 < m_2$, and $A^{m_1} = A^{m_2}$.

Let p be the index of any row of A^{m_1} possessing two or more nonzero entries, and let Q be the set formed by the indices of the columns where such nonzero entries appear, so that $|Q| \geq 2$, and

$$A^{m_1}_{p,j} = 1 \iff j \in Q.$$

In particular $f^{m_1}(X_p)$ has a nonempty intersection with X_q, for each q in Q. Notice that for any such q, it is impossible that

$$f^{m_1}(X_p) \subseteq X_q,$$

since the X_i's are pairwise disjoint and $f^{m_1}(X_p)$ must intersect at least another X_i, given that $|Q| \geq 2$. Thus, given q in Q, when comparing $f^{m_1}(X_p)$ with X_q from the point of view of (2.1.1), the only remaining alternative is that

$$f^{m_1}(X_p) \supseteq X_q.$$

Since $f^{m_1}(X_p)$ does not intersect X_j, for $j \notin Q$, we deduce that

$$f^{m_1}(X_p) = \bigcup_{q \in Q} X_q.$$

Observe that Q cannot be equal to $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, or else $f^{m_1}(X_p) = X$, and there would be no room for the image of the other X_i under the injective map f^{m_1}. Consequently

$$2 \leq |Q| < n.$$

Recalling that $A^{m_1} = A^{m_2}$, the above argument also proves that

$$f^{m_2}(X_p) = \bigcup_{q \in Q} X_q.$$

Defining $m := m_2 - m_1$, notice that

$$f^m\Big(\bigcup_{q \in Q} X_q\Big) = f^m\big(f^{m_1}(X_p)\big) = f^{m+m_1}(X_p) = f^{m_2}(X_p) = \bigcup_{q \in Q} X_q,$$

so we may restrict f^m to

$$X' := \bigcup_{q\in Q} X_q$$

obtaining an injective map

$$f^m : X' \to X',$$

satisfying all of the assumptions of the statement, with X' decomposing into a smaller number of parwise disjoint components X_q's. Therefore the result follows immediately by induction on n.

In order to prove (ii) we may now use (i) and hence we may assume that

$$f^m(X_i) \subseteq X_i,$$

for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and some $m > 0$. In case the above is a proper inclusion we are done, so we assume the contrary, meaning that $f^m(X_i) = X_i$. Setting

$$X' = \bigcup_{j\neq i} X_j,$$

and recalling that f^m is injective, we then have that

$$f^m(X') \subseteq X'.$$

Observe that this must is a proper inclusion since otherwise f^m would be surjective, contradicting the hypothesis. Therefore the conclusion follows again by induction on n. □

3. Preliminaries on semi-lattices and inverse semigroups.

In this section we will freely use the notation introduced in [**4**]. Our main goal will be to introduce the class of inverse semigroups to which our main result applies. We will also prove some basic related results.

3.1. Definition. A semi-lattice $\mathcal{E}$ with zero is called *tree-like* if, for any e and f in $\mathcal{E}$, one has that

$$e \perp f, \quad e \leq f, \quad \text{or} \quad e \geq f.$$

If $\mathcal{S}$ is an inverse semigroup whose idempotent semi-lattice is tree-like, we will say that $\mathcal{S}$ is *tree-like*.

Given e and f in a semi-lattice, it is easy to see that

$$e \leq f \Rightarrow D^\theta_e \subseteq D^\theta_f. \tag{3.2}$$

The converse of this fact is however not true. For example, if $\mathcal{S}$ is obtained by adding a zero element to an inverse semigroup without a zero, then

$$\xi := \mathcal{E} \setminus \{0\}$$

is the only ultra-filter on $\mathcal{E}$. Consequently $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\rm tight} = \{\xi\}$, and then $D^\theta_e = \{\xi\}$ for every nonzero idempotent e, so the converse of (3.2) is seen to fail badly. However, in a tree-like inverse semigroup, it is easy to see that

$$D^\theta_e \subsetneqq D^\theta_f \Rightarrow e \leq f, \tag{3.3}$$

simply because, under the assumption that $D^\theta_e \subsetneqq D^\theta_f$, alternatives "$e \perp f$" and "$e \geq f$" are clearly excluded.

The strict inclusion above has other interesting consequences. Assuming that $D^\theta_f \setminus D^\theta_e$ is indeed nonempty, and noticing that it is an open subset of $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\rm tight}$, we may find an ultra-filter ξ there, meaning that $f \in \xi$ and $e \notin \xi$. By [**2**: Lemma 12.3], it follows that there exists some $d \in \xi$ such that $d \perp e$, and upon replacing d with df, we may clearly assume that $d \leq f$.

3.4. Definition. Given e and f in a semi-lattice $\mathcal{E}$, we will say that $e \ll f$, whenever $e \leq f$, and there exists a nonzero $d \leq f$ such that $d \perp e$.

Using this terminology we may then state the following fact:

3.5. Proposition. *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a tree-like semi-lattice. Then*

$$D^\theta_e \subsetneqq D^\theta_f \Rightarrow e \ll f, \quad \forall\, e, f \in \mathcal{E}.$$

There is another slightly annoying question related to the converse of (3.2) which we would like to get out of our way as soon as possible:

3.6. Proposition. *Given any inverse semigroup $\mathcal{S}$, and given $s \in \mathcal{S}$, and $e \in \mathcal{E}$, we have that:*

(i) *if $e \leq s^*s$, then D^θ_e is contained in the domain of θ_s, and $\theta_s(D^\theta_e) = D^\theta_{ses^*}$.*

(ii) *if D^θ_e is contained in the domain of θ_s, then $\theta_s(D^\theta_e) = D^\theta_{ses^*}$.*

Proof. The first assertion in (i) is obvious. As for the second, recall that θ_e is the identity map on D^θ_e so, in particular, the range of θ_e is D^θ_e. Thus,

$$\theta_s(D^\theta_e) = \theta_s\big(\text{Ran}(\theta_e)\big) = \text{Ran}(\theta_s\theta_e) = \text{Ran}(\theta_{se}) = D^\theta_{se(se)^*} = D^\theta_{ses^*},$$

proving (i).

As the reader may have already anticipated, the catch in (ii) is that it is assumed that $D^\theta_e \subseteq D^\theta_{s^*s}$, but not necessarily that $e \leq s^*s$. Fortunately this can be easily circumvented as follows:

$$\theta_s(D^\theta_e) = \theta_s(D^\theta_e \cap D^\theta_{s^*s}) = \theta_s(D^\theta_{es^*s}) \overset{\text{(i)}}{=} D^\theta_{s(es^*s)s^*} = D^\theta_{ses^*}. \qquad \square$$

4. The main result.

Given the above preparations, we are now ready to prove our main result.

4.1. Theorem. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a tree-like inverse semigroup such that every tight filter in $\mathcal{E}$ is an ultra-filter. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) *$\mathcal{S}$ is locally contracting,*

(ii) *the standard action $\theta : \mathcal{S} \curvearrowright \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\rm tight}$ is locally contracting,*

(iii) *for every nonzero $e \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists an idempotent $f \leq e$, and an element $s \in \mathcal{S}$, such that $f \leq s^*s$, and $sfs^* \ll f$.*

Proof. The equivalence between (i) and (ii) follows from [**4**: Theorem 6.5].

In order to prove that (iii) implies (i), given a nonzero e in $\mathcal{E}$, let f and s be as in (iii). Since $sfs^* \ll f$, there exists a nonzero $f_0 \leq f$, such that $f_0 \perp sfs^*$, and then we see that f_0 together with $f_1 := f$ obey the conditions of [**4**: Proposition 6.7], from where one deduces that $\mathcal{S}$ is locally contracting, proving (i).

The most delicate part of this proof is the implication (i)⇒(iii), which we take up next. Given a nonzero $e \in \mathcal{E}$, let $U = D^\theta_e$, and choose s and V as in [**4**: Definition 6.2] so that,

$$V \subseteq U, \quad \overline{V} \subseteq D^\theta_{s^*s}, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_s(\overline{V}) \subsetneqq V.$$

In the first part of the proof we will show that V may be chosen to be of the form

$$V = \bigcup_{f\in F} D^\theta_f,$$

where F is a finite set of idempotents satisfying $f \leq es^*s$.

In order to achieve this, for each ξ in $\theta_s(\overline{V})$, choose a neighborhood of ξ contained in V. By hypothesis we have that ξ is an ultra-filter, and by [**4**: Proposition 2.5] we may suppose that such a neighborhood is of the form $D^\theta_{f_\xi}$, for some f_ξ in $\mathcal{E}$, whence

$$\xi \in D^\theta_{f_\xi} \subseteq V,$$

so we see that the $D^\theta_{f_\xi}$ form an open cover for $\theta_s(\overline{V})$. Since

$$V \subseteq U \cap D^\theta_{s^*s} = D^\theta_e \cap D^\theta_{s^*s} = D^\theta_{es^*s}, \tag{4.1.1}$$

then also each $D^\theta_{f_\xi} \subseteq D^\theta_{es^*s}$, and therefore

$$D^\theta_{f_\xi} = D^\theta_{es^*s} \cap D^\theta_{f_\xi} = D^\theta_{es^*sf_\xi}.$$

Upon replacing each f_ξ by

$$f'_\xi := es^*sf_\xi,$$

we may therefore assume that $f_\xi \leq es^*s$.

Being a closed subset of $D^\theta_{s^*s}$, observe that $\overline{V}$ is compact, and hence so is $\theta_s(\overline{V})$. We may then take a finite subcover of the above cover, say

$$\theta_s(\overline{V}) \ \subseteq \ \bigcup_{f\in F'} D^\theta_f, \tag{4.1.2}$$

where F' is a finite set consisting of some of the f_ξ.

We next claim that there exists a nonzero idempotent $f_0 \leq es^*s$, such that

$$D^\theta_{f_0} \subseteq V \setminus \theta_s(\overline{V}). \tag{4.1.3}$$

To see this, first observe that $V\setminus\theta_s(\overline{V})$ is open and nonempty. Even without assuming that all tight filters are ultra-filters, we may use the density of the set formed by the latter to find some ultra-filter ξ in $V\setminus\theta_s(\overline{V})$. An application of [**4**: Proposition 2.5] then provides f_0 in $\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$\xi \subseteq D^\theta_{f_0} \subseteq V \setminus \theta_s(\overline{V}), \tag{4.1.4}$$

and, again by (4.1.1), we may assume that $f_0 \leq es^*s$. Adding f_0 to F', we form the set

$$F := \{f_0\} \cup F',$$

with which we define

$$W := \bigcup_{f\in F} D^\theta_f. \tag{4.1.5}$$

We then have that W is clopen, and that

$$\theta_s(\overline{V}) \subsetneqq W \subseteq V,$$

where the proper inclusion above is a consequence of (4.1.4) and the fact that we have included f_0 in F. Applying θ_s to the sets above we then deduce that

$$\theta_s(W) \ \subseteq \ \theta_s(V) \ \subseteq \ \theta_s(\overline{V}) \ \subsetneqq \ W.$$

This completes the task outlined at the beginning of the proof.

Notice that for any f_1 and f_2 in F, we have by (i) that

$$f_1 \perp f_2, \quad f_1 \leq f_2, \quad \text{or} \quad f_1 \geq f_2,$$

in which case

$$D^\theta_{f_1} \cap D^\theta_{f_2} = \emptyset, \quad D^\theta_{f_1} \subseteq D^\theta_{f_2}, \quad \text{or} \quad D^\theta_{f_1} \supseteq D^\theta_{f_2},$$

respectively. Replacing F by the subset of its maximal elements we may then assume that F is formed by pairwise orthogonal idempotents, in which case (4.1.5) is a disjoint union.

In order to proceed, let us consider two cases.

Case 1: Assuming that $|F| = 1$, say $F = \{f\}$, we have that $W = D^\theta_f$, and then

$$D^\theta_{sfs^*} \overset{(3.6.\text{i})}{=} \theta_s(D^\theta_f) = \theta_s(W) \subsetneqq W = D^\theta_f,$$

so (3.5) implies that $sfs^* \ll f$, concluding the proof.

Case 2: Assuming that $|F| > 1$, let us consider θ_s as a function

$$\theta_s : W \to W,$$

observing that it is an injective but not surjective map. Using (2.1) and the fact that (4.1.5) is a disjoint union, we have that

$$\theta_s^m(D_f^\theta) \subsetneq D_f^\theta,$$

for some integer $m > 0$, and some f in F. We next notice that

$$\theta_s^m(D_f^\theta) = \theta_{s^m}(D_f^\theta) \overset{(3.6.\text{ii})}{=} D_{s^m f s^{*m}}^\theta,$$

so we deduce from the above that

$$D_{s^m f s^{*m}}^\theta \subsetneq D_f^\theta,$$

and then (3.5) implies that $s^m f s^{*m} \ll f$.

To conclude we must still address the requirement that $f \leq s^{*m}s^m$. For this observe that since W is contained in the domain of θ_s, and since W is invariant under θ_s, we have that W is also contained in the domain of θ_s^m, namely

$$W \subseteq D_{s^{*m}s^m}^\theta.$$

Recalling that we are working under the hypothesis that $|F| > 1$, we have that D_f^θ is a proper subset of W, so

$$D_f^\theta \subsetneq W \subseteq D_{s^{*m}s^m}^\theta,$$

and then $f \ll s^{*m}s^m$, by (3.5). □

The main point we would like to make in the present work is that, even though the definition of locally contracting actions given in [**4**: Definition 6.2] is syntactically closer to (4.1.iii), from a logical point of view, the former is closer to the notion of locally contracting inverse semigroup described in [**4**: Definition 6.4], since these are equivalent to each other under broader conditions, as proved in [**4**: Theorem 6.5]

As seen in Theorem (4.1), above, all of these are equivalent to each other under the rather strong assumption that $\mathcal{S}$ is tree-like, but it would be highly desirable to decide if the tree-like property is indeed necessary for the proof of (4.1).

A related problem is to decide conditions under which the converse of [**4**: Proposition 6.3] also holds.

References

[1] C. Anantharaman-Delaroche, "Purely infinite C^*-algebras arising form dynamical systems", *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **125** (1997), no. 2, 199–225.

[2] R. Exel, "Inverse semigroups and combinatorial C*-algebras", *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc.*, **39** (2008), no. 2, 191–313.

[3] R. Exel, "Partial Dynamical Systems, Fell Bundles and Applications", Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, 351pp, 2014. Available online from mtm.ufsc.br/∼exel/publications. PDF file md5sum: bc4cbce3debdb584ca226176b9b76924.

[4] R. Exel and E. Pardo, "The tight groupoid of an inverse semigroup", arXiv:1408.5278 [math.OA], 2014.

[5] M. V. Lawson, "Compactable semilattices", *Semigroup Forum*, **81** (2010), no. 1, 187–199.

Departamento de Matemática; Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina; 88010-970 Florianópolis SC; Brazil